

multiple elasticized and nonelasticized regions within a single overall activated elasticized zone.

Remarks

Reexamination and reconsideration of the subject application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 and 46-64 in the currently pending application stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as vague and indefinite. Specifically, the terms "preferential activation zone" and "non-preferential activation zone" have been objected to as being indefinite with respect to meaning. The generic description of the terms "preferential activation zone" and "non-preferential activation zone" is found in the specification at page 27, line 23 to page 29, line 33. The preferential activation zone refers to a region of the multi-layer film laminate which will preferentially elongate when the film laminate as a whole is elongated. Conversely, the non-preferential activation zone is a section of the film laminate which will preferentially retain its original dimensions when the film laminate as a whole is elongated.

Claim 29 recites preferential activation regions and non-preferential activation regions. Again, the generic definition of these two terms can be found at page 27, line 23 to page 29, line 33. As explained on page 27, the preferential activation zones can comprise a single uniform preferential activation region for multiple regions of differing activation characteristics (see, e.g., page 27, lines 27-33, which describes the relationship between preferential activation regions and preferential activation zones. The preferential activation regions are determined by relative modulus values, i.e., the lower modulus value regions would be the preferential activation regions. This discussion is also

applicable to preferential activation regions created by stress modification, see page 29, line 5). The preferential activation regions, and zones formed therefrom, can be created by a wide variety of treatment techniques which are specifically brought out, e.g., in the claims dependent on claim 1; such as; annealing (claim 12), plasticization (claim 13), differential crosslinking (claim 14), differing layer arrangements (claims 15-18), or preferential stress treatment by scoring, ablating, corona treating or removal of material (claim 28).

The last sentence in the rejection of June 24, 1992 contains the term "('lonjication" which Applicants are unable to understand and respond to.

Attached for the Examiner's convenience is an Examination Report, from the EPO Examiner, on claims in the corresponding PCT application. Attached to this Examination Report is an Attachment 1, which identifies the location in the specification where language used in the claims finds support.

In view of the above, further and favorable action in the form of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any further questions about the terminology employed in the claims or other items of concern with respect to the above-identified application, he is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at (612) 736-4790.

Respectfully submitted,


William J. Bond
Registration No. 32,400

Dated: 8/6/92

MINNESOTA MINING AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY
3M Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
P.O. Box 33427
St. Paul, Minnesota 55144-3427
(612) 736-4790
WJBAMD3/44938-5A.5